

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action, mailed January 5, 2009, considered and rejected claims 1-14, 16 and 18-29. Claims 1-11 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-14, 16 and 18-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Andrew* (U.S. Publ. No. 2003/0074647) in view of *Reynar* (EP1091303A2, Published 11/04/2001). Claim 29 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form..<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claims 1,16 and 29 are amended, while no claims are added or cancelled. Accordingly, following entry of this paper, claims 1-14, 16 and 18-29 remain pending, of which claims 1, 16 and 28 are the only independent claims at issue.

Applicant's claims generally relate to changing focus on displayed objects of a content page. As reflected in claim 1, an input mechanism is used for inputting text into plurality of text fields for an application wherein each of the plurality of text fields are configured to receive a sequence of text characters. A context component having first interface invocable by executable software code is used for setting first and second input scopes for respective first and second text fields of the plurality of text fields for the application. An input scope is a subset of a language used to define what one or more words, numbers, or punctuations are allowed to be written and in what order they are allowed to be written to form a sequence of text characters in the text input field. The first and second input scopes are different input scopes and chosen from one or more of the following: a list of input scopes, a list of words or phrases, a common input scope, or a custom input scope. A recognizer is operably coupled to the context component and input mechanism for invoking a second interface of the context component for receiving and applying the first and second input scopes for the respective first and second text fields such that as sequences of text characters are entered into each of the first and second text input fields, the sequence of text characters are compared with text within the respective first and second input scopes set in order to determine what text input is expected by the application for the respective first and second text input fields. When unexpected text is encountered (either by not matching the words, numbers or punctuations allowed, or by not matching the order allowed), the text is not displayed in the first or second text fields.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Independent claim 16 recites a method similar to that of claim 1. Claim 20 recites a computer-readable storage medium generally corresponding to the method of claim 16.

## 1. Claim Objections

As reflected above, claims 1-11 were rejected to for "informalities." Specifically, claims 1, 2-4 and 6-11 were objected to for using the phrase "first interface" and "second interface," while the Office requested that they be changed to "first application programming interface" and "second application programming interface." Applicant respectfully traverses.

It will be noted that the phrase "application programming interface" is found in the specification and included in claims 16-29. The Office has provided, however, no explanation of why Applicant must replace the broader language in claims 1-11 with the more narrow language in claims 16-29. It appears that the Office is merely requesting claims 1-11 be narrowed consistent with claims 16-29. That Applicant has chosen broader over narrower language is not, however, an "informality" and is thus not objectionable.

## 2. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As noted above, all of the rejected claims were rejected based at least in part on a combination of *Andrew* and *Reynar*. In general, *Andrew* and *Reynar* each generally relate to text input; however, Applicant respectfully submits that they fail, whether cited alone or in combination, to disclose or reasonably support the claims as currently presented.

For example, *Andrew* discloses an automatic software input panel selection based on application program state. In particular, a method and system are disclosed for automatically selecting a software input method and/or adjusting the keys displayed on a software input panel of a software input method based on the state of an application program. In this manner, strings of characters or other symbols can be input using a variety of different input mechanisms (e.g., keyboards, calculator, formula editor, chemical symbol template, voice recognition, etc.). (See ¶ 29).

Notably, *Andrew* relates to an application that has focus and state information, and then input information into that application—and possibly changing keys displayed on a software input panel such as a soft keyboard—based on the state of that application. *Andrew* does not appear, however, to have a disclosure specific to input scopes that limit the characters, words,

symbols, or punctuation and the order of entry, and particularly not in a manner that prevents anything not within the focus scope or not in the order specified by the focus scope, from being displayed, as recited in combination with the other art of record.

Indeed, when the cited references are combined, they disclose a system that operates opposite to that disclosed in various regards. For example, *Reynar* discloses a system that allows a user to enter text into a computer, and thereafter begin the correction process by selecting a portion of text that the user entered. (§ 14). There can be multiple components and the edited text can be a subset of the text selection that the user input through the input source. (*Id.*). Once the user selects the text, the user can then get alternatives for the text, and a stochastic input combiner can parse the text selection into components and obtain alternatives based on the parsed text selection. (§ 15).

Of significance is that *Reynar* operates by displaying the text and thereafter making corrections as desired by a user. In contrast, however, the pending claims recite that when the text is input, the input scope that defines what text and the order of text that is allowed is also utilized to prevent display of text that either doesn't meet the criteria for text (e.g., words, numbers, or punctuation) or the order of the text, as recited in combination with the other claim elements. Implementing such a system with the combination of *Andrew* and *Reynar* would render the *Reynar* system inoperable inasmuch as it relies upon selecting previously entered text before corrections can be made.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required reason why one skilled in the art would have modified the cited art in the manner officially noticed.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
COLBY C. NUTTALL  
Registration No. 58,146  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

RDN:CCN:gd  
2279436\_1.DOC